

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1 to 12 will be pending in the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 have been amended, and claims 10-12 have been added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification (in reference to US 2006-0149014) at, *inter alia*, paragraph [0030] and the original claims. No new matter has been added herein by the present amendments.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant points out that the amendments made herein are made without prejudice to the future prosecution of such cancelled, amended or modified subject matter in a related divisional, continuation or continuation-in-part application.

### **II. Objection to Claims**

Claims 1 and 3 have been objected to due to the use of the term “preferably.” Applicant has herein amended these claims accordingly. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these claim objections have been overcome and should therefore be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “the pressure drop” in claim 4 lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has

herein amended claim 4 to depend from new claim 11, which provides proper antecedent basis for the limitation “the pressure drop.” Support for new claim 11 can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, paragraph [0030] (in reference to US 2006-0149014).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should therefore be withdrawn.

**IV. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 1 to 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,384,155 (“Van Swieten et al.”). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Swieten et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,778,422 (“Farber et al.”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,274,690 (“Hoshida et al.”). Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that Van Swieten et al. discloses a polymerization according to the same method as the instant claims, and that the cooling capacity of the method disclosed in Van Swieten et al. is inherent to the process. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion for at least the following reasons. In Table VII, Example F in Van Swieten et al., vinyl chloride monomer is polymerized using 0.05 %w/w of Trigonox EHP-C70 and 0.01 %w/w of Trigonox 187-C30 as initiator. The dosing time was 2.5 hours after the start of the heat-up in 1 hour. Performance of Example F wherein the second initiator (Trigonox 187-C30) is dosed in 1 hour after 2.5 hours from the start of the polymerization shows that the second initiator is added after 12% of the monomer has been polymerized. Therefore, the second initiator in Example F of Van Swieten et al. is not “dosed at least partially from the start of the polymerization until 10% of the monomer(s) has

been polymerized,” as is presently claimed in independent claim 1. Dependent claims 2-12 all ultimately depend from claim 1, and thus include this limitation as well. Thus, Van Swieten et al. does not disclose nor suggest the presently claimed invention.

In addition, neither Farber et al. nor Hoshida et al. cure the shortcomings of Van Swieten et al. That is, neither Farber et al. nor Hoshida et al. teach or suggest a second initiator “dosed at least partially from the start of the polymerization until 10% of the monomer(s) has been polymerized.”

Therefore, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the presently claimed process which includes a second initiator “dosed at least partially from the start of the polymerization until 10% of the monomer(s) has been polymerized.” For at least the preceding reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 have been overcome and should therefore be withdrawn.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the preceding amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and prompt consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: April 13, 2009

By: /Kevin T. Godlewski/  
Kevin T. Godlewski (Reg. No. 47,598)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
Facsimile: (212) 425-5288  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**